## IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

ALEJANDRO F. MICHEL,	) No. C 08-1724 JSW (PR)	
Petitioner,	}	
vs. J. WALKER, Warden,	ORDER DENYING CERTIFICATE OF APPEALABILITY (Docket no. 12)	
Respondent.	)	

Petitioner, a prisoner of the State of California, filed a *pro se* petition for a writ of habeas corpus under 28 U.S.C. § 2254 . In an order dated March 17, 2009, this Court dismissed the petition as untimely (docket no. 10). Petitioner has filed a notice of appeal and a motion seeking a certificate of appealability (docket no. 10).

A judge shall grant a COA "only if the applicant has made a substantial showing of the denial of a constitutional right." 28 U.S.C. § 2253(c)(2). "Determining whether a COA should issue where the petition was dismissed on procedural grounds has two components, one directed at the underlying constitutional claims and one directed at the district court's procedural holding." *Slack v. McDaniel*, 529 U.S. 473, 484-85 (2000). "When the district court denies a habeas petition on procedural grounds without reaching the prisoner's underlying constitutional claim, a COA should issue when the prisoner shows, at least, that jurists of reason would find it debatable whether the petition states a valid claim of the denial of a constitutional right and that jurists of reason would find it debatable whether the district court was correct in its procedural ruling." *Id.* at 484; *see James v. Giles*, 221 F.3d 1074, 1077 (9th Cir. 2000). As each of these components is a

"threshold inquiry," the federal court "may find that it can dispose of the application in a fair and prompt manner if it proceeds first to resolve the issue whose answer is more apparent from the record and arguments." *Slack*, 529 U.S. at 485. Supreme Court jurisprudence "allows and encourages" federal courts to first resolve the procedural issue. *See id*.

Petitioner has not established that "jurists of reason would find it debatable whether the district court was correct in its procedural ruling." *Id.* at 484. Accordingly, the request for a certificate of appealability is DENIED (docket no. 12). The Clerk of Court shall forward this order, along with the case file, to the United States Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit. *United States v. Asrar*, 116 F.3d 1268, 1270 (9th Cir. 1997).

IT IS SO ORDERED.

DATED: May 26, 2009

JEFFREY S. WHITE United States District Judge

Afry S White

1	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT	
2	FOR THE	
3	NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA	
4		
5		
6	ALEJANDRO F. MICHEL,  Case Number: CV08-01724 JSW	
7	Plaintiff, CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE	
8	V.	
9	WILLIAM T. SULLIVAN et al,	
10	Defendant.	
11		
12	I, the undersigned, hereby certify that I am an employee in the Office of the Clerk, U.S. D Court, Northern District of California.	istrict
13	That on May 26, 2009, I SERVED a true and correct copy(ies) of the attached, by placing	said
14	copy(ies) in a postage paid envelope addressed to the person(s) hereinafter listed, by depo said envelope in the U.S. Mail, or by placing said copy(ies) into an inter-office delivery	siting
15	receptacle located in the Clerk's office.	
16		
17		
18	Alejandro F. Michel T86169	
19	CSP-Sacramento P.O. Box 290066	
20	Represa, CA 95671	
21	Dated: May 26, 2009	
22	Dated: May 26, 2009  Richard W. Wieking, Clerk	
23	By: Jennifer Ottolini, Deputy Clerk	
24		
25		
26		
27		
28		